

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Official Action dated 02 September 2005 has been carefully considered, along with cited references, applicable sections of the Patent Act, Patent Rules, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure and relevant decisional law.

The disclosure is objected to because of several informalities.

(A) The word “collected” (page 3, line 9) should apparently be changed to --collect--. (B) The word “includes” (page 6, line 23) should apparently be changed to --include--.

In response, the disclosure has been amended according to the Examiner’s suggestions.

Claims 1-3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Harris et al.

Claims 4, 5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Tillman, Jr.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. taken together with Tillman, Jr., as applied to claim 8 in paragraph 6 above, and further in view of Avondoglio.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Spanton.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. in view of Kato et al.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris et al. taken together with Kato et al., as applied to claim 13 in paragraph 9 above, and further in view of

Cicirello.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kato et al.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is significantly different from that of the cited arts as can be seen from their respective structures. Applicant's invention as specified in the amended claims 1, 4-5, 9-11 and 13-14 is patentably distinguishable over these references when taken either singularly or in combination for the following reasons:

For claims 1-3, 6, and 7, the Examiner cites Harris et al. as an example showing an air purification device with a housing 18, a filter 26, 28, fan 14, an ultraviolet ray light device 16, pressurized compartment 38, a vertical plate 32 having an orifice near the fan, another filter 24 slidable in flanges 70, and a horizontal partition separating the housing into an upper chamber and lower space.

For claims 4, 5, 8, and 9, the Examiner further cites Tillman, Jr. as an example teaching the well-known use of a ULPA filter and a filter positioned on a horizontal partition in an air treatment device for the purposes of ensuring maximum capture of all contaminants on the filter medium.

For claims 10 and 11, the Examiner further cites Avondoglio as an example teaching the use of a collecting tray below a filter in an air treatment device for the purposes of ensuring convenient particle removal.

For claim 12, the Examiner further cites Spanton as an example teaching the well-known use of an ozone generator in an air

treatment device for the purposes of improving air sterilization.

For claim 13, the Examiner further cites Kato et al. as an example teaching the use of an oxygen generator in an air treatment device for the purposes of ensuring ion neutralization and removal of excess ozone.

For claim 14, the Examiner further cites Cicirello as an example teaching the use of a hose passing gaseous additives in an air treatment device for the purposes of maximizing treatment of the air.

For claim 15, the Examiner further states that Kato et al. do not explicitly mention that the device is an air treatment device. However, Kato et al. do disclose that the device is an air purifier device which is a specific type of air treatment.

However, actually, Harris et al. discloses an air treatment device failed to provide an ozone generator (70) to generate and supply ozone through a filter element (40), nor an oxygen generator (80) to generate and supply oxygen out of a housing (10).

Actually, in Kato et al., as disclosed in col. 4, lines 50-56, the metallic filter 14 neutralizes the plus ions which have passed through the electrostatic dust collector and at the same time it reduces the ozone resulting from metal oxidization to O₂. Kato et al. failed to provide an ozone generator (70) to generate and supply ozone through a filter element (40), nor an oxygen generator (80) to generate and supply oxygen out of a housing (10).

Actually, in Spanton, the reference numeral "15" indicates an ozone generator lamp, but not an ozone generator. Spanton failed to provide an ozone generator (70) for generating and supplying an

ozone through a filter element (40), nor to provide an oxygen generator (80) for generating and supplying an oxygen out of the housing (10).

By contrast, in Applicant's invention, as amended in the amended claims 1, 4-5, 9-11 and 13-14, a filter element (40) is disposed in the housing (10), an ultraviolet ray light device (50) disposed in front of a filter element (40) and disposed in the pressurized compartment (41) of the housing (10) for generating ultraviolet rays to kill germ, and simultaneously an ozone generator (70) to generate and supply ozone through the filter element (40) for germ killing purposes. In operation, a light medium, such as TiO₂, may be disposed or filled within the pressurized compartment (41) of the housing (10) for being acted with the ultraviolet rays generated by the ultraviolet ray light device (50) and for killing germs.

The cited arts fail to teach an air treatment device including a filter element (40) disposed in a housing (10), an ultraviolet ray light device (50) disposed in front of a filter element (40) and disposed in the pressurized compartment (41) of the housing (10) for generating ultraviolet rays to kill germ, and simultaneously an ozone generator (70) to generate and supply ozone through the filter element (40) for killing germ in series. The applicant's invention is different from that of the cited arts and has improved over the cited arts.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is patentably distinguishable over the cited arts and that the application is now in

condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Courtesy and cooperation of Examiner CHIESA are
appreciated.

respectfully submitted,

By: Charles E. Baxley

CHARLES E. BAXLEY

Attorney of Record

USPTO Reg. 20,149

90 John Street – 3rd Floor

New York, N.Y. 10038

TEL: (212) 791-7200

FAX: (212) 791-7276

Date: New York, N.Y.